arXiv:1108.4343v3 [physics.class-ph] 9 Apr 2012

Is the magnetic force a kinematical consequence of Thomas precession?

David C. Lush
d.lush@comcast.net

(Dated: April 10, 2012)

The requirements imposed by relativistic covariance on the physical description of two interacting classical charged particles are investigated. If it is assumed that rotational pseudoforces do not exist in Thomas-precessing particle rest frames, then kinematical considerations demand the presence of compensatory forces in inertial reference frames. It is shown that in a system of two mutually-circular-orbiting classical charged particles of equal mass, the magnetic force on either particle in the center-of-mass frame may be regarded as part of an anti-Coriolis force in the rest frame of the other, due to a hypothesized lack of Coriolis force in the Thomas-precessing rest frame. The plausibility that an anti-centrifugal force of the Thomas precession may account for the binding of quarks into nucleons is also investigated.

PACS numbers: 03.30.+p, 41.20.-q, 45.05.+x, 45.20.da

I. INTRODUCTION

The rest frames of charged particles interacting electromagnetically are known to rotate relative to the laboratory inertial reference frame, due to the Thomas precession [1]. This raises a question of whether a description of the interaction in the rest frame of either particle should include pseudoforces due to the rotation. It seems reasonable to expect that since the Thomas precession is a "freely falling" sort of rotational motion, it should not give rise to pseudoforces such as the Coriolis or centrifugal forces typically associated with rotating reference frames. (Indeed, that there is no centrifugal force experienced by an observer in a Thomas-precessing frame is acknowleged in the university physics course materials of [2].) However, kinematics requires that when two reference frames are relatively rotating, similar forces must be present in one frame or the other. Thus, for example, if there is no Coriolis force in the rest frame of a particle, a Coriolis-like force must exist in the laboratory frame, that accounts for its absence in the particle rest frame. The force that arises kinematically to account for an absence of the Coriolis force is equal and opposite the expected Coriolis force in the particle rest frame, and so will be called herein an anti-Coriolis force. Such a force can plausibly correspond to the magnetic force, as the latter is formally similar to the Coriolis force.

The main intent of this work is to assess with the simplest possible analysis whether or not the magnetic part of the Lorentz force on a moving electrical charge is plausibly consistent with the form it would take were it a kinematical force compensating for absent Coriolis forces in particle rest frames. A simple system is considered consisting of two oppositely-charged spinless particles in relative motion, initially not necessarily bound, but assumed to be nonrelativistic except for the effects of Thomas precession. The scale of the system is assumed such that delay effects can be regarded as negligible. An atomic scale two-particle system such as the hydrogen or positronium atom is a suitable notional model. The particles are referred to as an electron and a proton, but the "proton" mass is initially as a free parameter of the analysis, until it is restricted to equal to the electron's. (The restriction to equal particle masses is necessary to arrive at an anti-Coriolis force that is consistent with the known magnetic force.)

Nonrelativistic equations of motion in the inertial laboratory reference frame for the two particles are first developed using the standard electric and magnetic field (that can be derived from the Liénard-Wiechert field expressions [3] by making the dynamical restrictions as described) and Lorentz force expressions, and the nonrelativistic Newtonian law of motion. (The law of motion for circular orbits is minimally relativistic because of the perpendicularity of the particle velocities to the acting forces.) A description of the proton motion is next developed in the Thomas-precessing electron rest frame. The description in the electron rest frame is based on the standard kinematical description of motion in a reference frame rotating with a constant angular velocity relative to the inertial frame. This description includes the Coriolis, centrifugal, and Euler pseudoforces, but the Euler pseudoforce vanishes here under the assumption of bound circular orbital motion. Equating the angular velocity of the rotating frame with the angular velocity of the Thomas precession, and taking the applied force on the proton to be the Lorentz force, it is then shown that a description without a net Coriolis force in the electron rest frame obtains the magnetic force in the laboratory frame provided that the electron and "proton" masses are equal. It is argued, it is therefore justified to consider the magnetic force as plausibly arising kinematically due to an absence of Coriolis forces in Thomas-precessing particle rest frames.

If the magnetic force can be related to the absence of Coriolis force in particle rest frames, a further question arises about what are the laboratory-frame correspondents to the also hypothetically-absent centrifugal and Euler forces. After discussion about the possibility that the Lorentz force as commonly accepted may be incomplete, the nature of the hypothetical anticentrifugal force is investigated by considering its relative magnitude in comparison to Coulomb repulsion in a two-particle system consisting of two mutually-circular-orbiting relativistic point charges of like polarity. In the minimally-relativistic context of the present paper, however, the character of the conjectural anti-Euler force can be only briefly discussed.

II. LABORATORY FRAME INTERACTION OF TWO CHARGED PARTICLES

Let $\boldsymbol{r}_e$ and $\boldsymbol{r}_p$ represent position vectors to an electron of mass m_e, and a "proton" of indefinite but nonzero mass m_p, in an inertial reference frame (IRF), $\boldsymbol{r} \equiv \boldsymbol{r}_p - \boldsymbol{r}_e$, and $R \equiv |\boldsymbol{r}|$. It is assumed that the particles have no intrinsic magnetic moments. The mutual Coulomb force on the electron and proton is then given (in Gaussian units) by

$$\boldsymbol{F}_{\mathrm{Coul},e} = -\frac{q_p q_e}{R^3}(\boldsymbol{r}_p - \boldsymbol{r}_e) = -\boldsymbol{F}_{\mathrm{Coul},p} \tag{1}$$

where q_p and q_e are the electron and proton electric charges which will be taken here as the usual values of e and $-e$ with e the fundamental charge magnitude. Within the scope of the present approximation, the magnetic field at the proton is

$$\boldsymbol{B} = \frac{q_e}{cR^3}\boldsymbol{v}_e \times \boldsymbol{r}. \tag{2}$$

The total Lorentz force (neglecting radiation damping) on the proton is then

$$\boldsymbol{F}_p = \frac{q_p q_e \boldsymbol{r}}{R^3} + \frac{q_p q_e}{c^2 R^3}\boldsymbol{v}_p \times (\boldsymbol{v}_e \times \boldsymbol{r}). \tag{3}$$

The total Lorentz force on the electron is similarly

$$\boldsymbol{F}_e = -\frac{q_p q_e \boldsymbol{r}}{R^3} - \frac{q_p q_e}{c^2 R^3}\boldsymbol{v}_e \times (\boldsymbol{v}_p \times \boldsymbol{r}). \tag{4}$$

The electron acceleration in the inertial laboratory frame is thus

$$\boldsymbol{a}_e = -\frac{q_p q_e \boldsymbol{r}}{m_e R^3} - \frac{q_p q_e}{m_e c^2 R^3}\boldsymbol{v}_e \times (\boldsymbol{v}_p \times \boldsymbol{r}). \tag{5}$$

The above is a sufficient description of the dynamics in the inertial laboratory frame, for the purpose of plausibility testing of the hypothesis that magnetic forces correspond to absent pseudoforces of rotation of particle rest frames.

III. TWO-PARTICLE INTERACTION DESCRIPTION IN ELECTRON REST FRAME

We hypothesize that in the rest frame (specifically, the parallel-transported or Fermi-Walker frame) of the electron, the net effective force on the proton is just the difference between the Coulomb attraction toward the electron and the nonrotational inertial force due to the acceleration of the electron. That is, it is hypothesized that there are no pseudoforces present effectively due to the Thomas precession of the electron rest frame. However, since the electron is accelerated due to the Coulomb and magnetic forces, and hence its rest frame also rotating due to Thomas precession, there must be kinematical forces due to the rotation relative to the inertial laboratory frame. (The inertial force due to electron acceleration will be incorporated separately from the rotation due to Thomas precession.) If the net force on the proton in the electron rest frame must then consist of the Coulomb force minus the electron acceleration, then additional forces must be present to counter the kinematical forces due to the rotation of the Thomas precession. These may then be examined for their possible similarity to the expected non-Coulomb electromagnetic forces.

The electron acceleration to zeroth order in v/c (which is adequate to determine the value of the angular velocity of Thomas precession to the precision needed for the present analysis) is

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{Coul},e} = -\frac{q_p q_e}{m_e R^3}(\boldsymbol{r}_p - \boldsymbol{r}_e) = -\frac{q_p q_e \boldsymbol{r}}{m_e R^3}. \tag{6}$$

The expression for "an infinitely small rotation angle of the axes of a coordinate system describing a curvilinear trajectory" is given by Malykin [4] (see his Eq. (3)) as

$$d\boldsymbol{\phi} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right)\frac{[\boldsymbol{v} \times d\boldsymbol{v}]}{v^2}, \tag{7}$$

with the relativistic factor $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-(v/c)^2}$, and where "$d\boldsymbol{v}$ is the vector of an infinitely small velocity change due to acceleration, ϕ is the rotation angle of the spatial coordinate axes of the system comoving with an elementary particle or a gyrocompass measured relative to the laboratory IRF," and $\boldsymbol{v}$ here is the velocity of the elementary particle or gyrocompass as measured in the laboratory IRF. The angular velocity of the Thomas precession corresponding to Eq. (7) is

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathrm{T}} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right)\frac{[\boldsymbol{v} \times \boldsymbol{a}]}{v^2}, \tag{8}$$

where $\boldsymbol{a}$ here is the acceleration of the elementary particle or gyrocompass as measured in the laboratory IRF.

(It can be noted that this formula for the angular velocity of the Thomas precession differs in sign and magnitude from other sources, for example as in [5] (see Eq.

(11.119) on page 552). Please refer to [4] for justification of the sign and magnitude as given by Eq. (8). The sign of the angular velocity of the Thomas precession is crucial to the analysis. The angular velocity magnitude as given by Eq. (8) is crucial to the analysis of the highly relativistic system considered in Section V herein.)

Now, for small $\beta = v/c$,

$$1 - \frac{1}{\gamma} \approx 1 - \left(1 - \frac{\beta^2}{2}\right) = \frac{\beta^2}{2}. \tag{9}$$

For small β and in the present notation Eq. (8) then becomes

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_\mathrm{T} \approx -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\boldsymbol{a}_e \times \boldsymbol{v}_e}{c^2} \approx \frac{q_p q_e}{2c^2 m_e R^3}\boldsymbol{r} \times \boldsymbol{v}_e. \tag{10}$$

The kinematical relationship between two coordinate frames, where one system is rotating relative to the other (at constant angular velocity), is evident in the familiar expression for the "effective" force $\boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{eff}$ on a body of mass m displaced $\boldsymbol{r}$ from the center of coordinates gyrating with angular velocity $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ relative to a non-rotating inertial reference frame [6]:

$$\boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{eff} = \boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{app} - 2m\boldsymbol{\omega}\times(\boldsymbol{v})_\mathrm{rot} - m\boldsymbol{\omega}\times(\boldsymbol{\omega}\times\boldsymbol{r}) - m\dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\times\boldsymbol{r}, \tag{11}$$

where $\boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{app}$ is an applied force in the non-rotating reference frame and $(\boldsymbol{v})_\mathrm{rot}$ represents the velocity as measured in the rotating frame. The second term on the right hand side, $-2m\boldsymbol{\omega} \times (\boldsymbol{v})_\mathrm{rot}$, is the Coriolis force, and the third, $-m\boldsymbol{\omega} \times (\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \boldsymbol{r})$, the centrifugal force. The fourth term is the Euler force, which vanishes in the case of a constant angular velocity of the rotating reference frame. This condition is met if the rotation is the Thomas precession of a particle rest frame, when the particle is bound in a classical circular orbit around another particle of opposite charge.

The effective force on the proton in the electron rest frame including as well the acceleration of the electron rest frame is

$$\boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{eff} = \boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{app} - m_p(2\boldsymbol{\omega}_\mathrm{T} \times (\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_p)_\mathrm{elec} + \boldsymbol{\omega}_\mathrm{T} \times (\boldsymbol{\omega}_\mathrm{T} \times \boldsymbol{r}) + \dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_\mathrm{T} \times \boldsymbol{r} + \boldsymbol{a}_e). \tag{12}$$

Restricting to circular orbit to avoid the complication of Euler forces, and neglecting the centrifugal force as being of order β^4 (where $\beta \equiv v/c$), obtains

$$\boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{eff} = \boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{app} - m_p(2\boldsymbol{\omega}_\mathrm{T} \times (\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_p)_\mathrm{elec} + \boldsymbol{a}_e). \tag{13}$$

Equation (13) can be rearranged to obtain the kinematically-necessary form of the applied force in the laboratory frame, from the effective force in the electron rest frame, as

$$\boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{app} = \boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{eff} + m_p(2\boldsymbol{\omega}_\mathrm{T} \times (\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_p)_\mathrm{elec} + \boldsymbol{a}_e). \tag{14}$$

Under the assumption that no Coriolis force is observed in the Thomas-precessing electron rest frame, but accounting for the acceleration of the electron relative to the proton due to the Lorentz force, and since the electron is stationary in its rest frame and so does not give rise to a magnetic field through its motion, we take the effective force on the proton in the electron rest frame here to be simply the Coulomb attraction between the two particles, plus the inertial force due to acceleration of the electron rest frame $\boldsymbol{a}_e$ from Eq. (5). The net applied force on the proton $\boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{app}$ in the laboratory frame is then

$$\boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{app} = \frac{q_p q_e \boldsymbol{r}}{R^3} + 2m_p\boldsymbol{\omega}_\mathrm{T} \times (\boldsymbol{v}_p)_\mathrm{elec}. \tag{15}$$

Now, $(\boldsymbol{v}_p)_\mathrm{elec}$ may be related to the proton velocity in the boosted laboratory frame as

$$(\boldsymbol{v}_p)_\mathrm{elec} = \boldsymbol{v}_p - \boldsymbol{v}_e - \boldsymbol{\omega}_\mathrm{T} \times \boldsymbol{r}, \tag{16}$$

and so to order β^2,

$$\boldsymbol{F}_\mathrm{app} = \frac{q_p q_e}{R^3}\boldsymbol{r} + 2m_p\boldsymbol{\omega}_\mathrm{T} \times (\boldsymbol{v}_p - \boldsymbol{v}_e)\,. \tag{17}$$

Substituting for the Thomas precession angular velocity $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathrm{T}}$ according to Eq. (10) into the Coriolis term obtains

$$\boldsymbol{F}_{\mathrm{app}} = \frac{q_p q_e}{R^3}\boldsymbol{r} + \frac{m_p}{m_e}\left[\frac{q_p q_e}{c^2 R^3}\boldsymbol{r}\times\boldsymbol{v}_e\right]\times\left[\boldsymbol{v}_p - \boldsymbol{v}_e\right]. \tag{18}$$

In the case $m_p = m_e \equiv m$ and with some rearrangement this becomes

$$\boldsymbol{F}_{\mathrm{app}} = \frac{q_p q_e}{R^3}\boldsymbol{r} + \frac{q_p q_e}{c^2 R^3}\boldsymbol{v}_p\times\left[\boldsymbol{v}_e\times\boldsymbol{r}\right] - \frac{q_p q_e}{c^2 R^3}\left[\boldsymbol{r}\times\boldsymbol{v}_e\right]\times\boldsymbol{v}_e. \tag{19}$$

With the vector identity $\boldsymbol{a}\times(\boldsymbol{b}\times\boldsymbol{c}) = (\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{a})\boldsymbol{b} - (\boldsymbol{b}\cdot\boldsymbol{a})\boldsymbol{c}$,

$$\boldsymbol{F}_{\mathrm{app}} = \frac{q_p q_e}{R^3}\boldsymbol{r} + \frac{q_p q_e}{c^2 R^3}\boldsymbol{v}_p\times\left[\boldsymbol{v}_e\times\boldsymbol{r}\right] - \frac{q_p q_e}{c^2 R^3}\left[(\boldsymbol{v}_e\cdot\boldsymbol{v}_e)\boldsymbol{r} - (\boldsymbol{r}\cdot\boldsymbol{v}_e)\boldsymbol{v}_e\right], \tag{20}$$

or (since we have already assumed bound circular motion such that $\boldsymbol{r}\cdot\boldsymbol{v}_e = 0$) and with $\gamma \equiv (1-\beta^2)^{-1/2}$,

$$\boldsymbol{F}_{\mathrm{app}} = \frac{q_p q_e}{{\gamma_e}^2 R^3}\boldsymbol{r} + \frac{q_p q_e}{c^2 R^3}\boldsymbol{v}_p\times\left[\boldsymbol{v}_e\times\boldsymbol{r}\right]. \tag{21}$$

Comparing Eq. (21) with Eq. (3), it is seen that the Lorentz force on the proton in the laboratory frame, including the part due to magnetic force, has been recovered by kinematically transforming an electron rest frame description without magnetic force to the laboratory frame. (Although the inverse factor of ${\gamma_e}^2$ in the first term on the right hand side of Eq. (21) was not present in Eq. (3), examination of the Liénard-Wiechert field expressions [3] reveals that it is expected when all necessary effects to order v^2/c^2 are included.)

IV. DISCUSSION

The following observations can be made based on the preceding analysis:

1) The expected Coriolis force of the Thomas precession is of the magnitude and sign needed to explain the origin of the magnetic force as an anti-Coriolis force, provided that the interacting particles are of equal mass, and that the velocities are as expected in circular classical bound motion. The restriction to circular motion is necessary because the present analysis did not take into account the time-variation of the angular velocity of the Thomas precession that is a consequence of non-circular motion, and the Euler pseudoforce that would then be present in the description of the motion in electron rest frame.

2) If the hypothesis that Thomas precession does not give rise to inertial forces of rotation in particle rest frames is correct, then the common expression for the Lorentz force is necessarily incomplete. In particular, the magnetic force must be richer than previously recognized, becoming for example more complicated between charged particles of unequal mass. Also, an anti-centrifugal force must exist in addition to the magnetic force. This force is negligible in the far field but may become very significant for highly relativistic interactions at small particle separations. Since it must counter the always-outward centrifugal force, it is always an attractive force.

3) An anti-Euler force associated with time variation of the angular velocity of the Thomas precession is also to be expected.

The magnetic force has been related by other authors to a Coriolis force [7], as well as to an anti-Coriolis force [8]. However, those analyses consider only the action of an electromagnetic field on a charged particle, from which alone it is not possible to infer the existence of anti-Euler or anticentrifugal forces. Existence of the latter are inferred only when the description is expanded to include the particle generating the field as well as that being acted upon.

Although electromagnetic forces were originally determined experimentally, the Lorentz force has been derived from Maxwell's field equations and energy-momentum conservation principles (as needed to incorporate radiation damping) by several authors [9–13]. Its determination by these methods does not lead necessarily to a unique solution [14] and so an extension to fully describe the anti-Coriolis forces as well as to incorporate anti-Euler and anticentrifugal forces may be possible using similar methods. The electromagnetic field as obtained from the Liénard-Wiechert field expressions in any case probably cannot give rise to the anticentrifugal force.

The expected form of the Lorentz force modification needed to describe magnetic interactions between particles of unequal mass or for uncorrelated motion seems derivable using elementary relativity theory with the simplifying approximation that $\beta << 1$. The expected form of the anti-Euler force may also be derivable within the small β regime. Deriving an expected form for the Lorentz force extension for the anticentrifugal force will be more difficult, as the assumption of $\beta << 1$ can no longer be made. Instead, a more careful analysis that allows for $\beta \approx 1$ and fully accounts for delay must be performed, using techniques such as used in [15–17]. Nonetheless, an attempt is made in the section following to assess whether the anticentrifugal force of the Thomas precession can plausibly correspond to the strong force that binds nucleons against electrostatic repulsion.

V. STRENGTH OF THE ANTICENTRIFUGAL FORCE COMPARED TO COULOMB REPULSION

Since a lack of centrifugal forces in Thomas-precessing particle rest frames must appear as an attractive force in the inertial laboratory frame, it is of interest to estimate the magnitude of this anticentrifugal force and assess under what circumstances it might become significant. As it has already been established as negligible at the atomic scale and small β, it will be necessary to consider more relativistic interactions. Also, since atomic nuclei are known to exist in states with zero orbital angular momentum, implying a vanishing angular velocity of the Thomas precession, the anticentrifugal force cannot be a candidate for directly binding nucleons together to form nuclei. Rather, because nucleons possess intrinsic angular momentum, it will be considered as a possible explanation for the force that binds quarks together to form nucleons. It will be considered adequate for the plausibility assessment to consider a system consisting of just two circular-orbiting particles of like electrical charge, rather than the actual three particles known to constitute nucleons.

Because the anticentrifugal force is observed from the laboratory frame, the particle massses are taken to be on the order of the proton mass. If it is assumed the two particles are of like electrical polarity and magnitude of the order of the elementary charge, and repulsed by naïve (that is, nonrelativistic and instantaneous inverse-square) Coulomb repulsion, yet circularly orbiting each other with laboratory-frame velocities near the speed of light, then it will be a simple matter to calculate at what orbital radius the anticentrifugal force will overcome naïve Coulomb repulsion. This orbital radius can then be compared with the measured size of a nucleon such as the proton.

If there are no inertial forces of rotation due to Thomas precession of particle rest frames, including no centrifugal forces, then an anti-centrifugal kinematical force is expected in the inertial laboratory frame as

$$\boldsymbol{F} = m\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathrm{T}} \times (\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathrm{T}} \times \boldsymbol{r}), \tag{22}$$

with (see Eq. (3) of [4])

$$\omega_{\mathrm{T}} \equiv |\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathrm{T}}| = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right)\omega, \tag{23}$$

where ω “is the angular velocity of the orbiting measured in the laboratory inertial reference frame”. So, for a particle circularly orbiting at radius r with laboratory frame velocity v, $\omega = v/r$. For $\beta \approx 1$, and letting $\beta = 1 - \epsilon$, with $\epsilon << 1$,

$$\omega_{\mathrm{T}} \approx \left(1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}\right)\frac{c(1-\epsilon)}{r} \approx \frac{c}{r}. \tag{24}$$

The anticentrifugal force magnitude for the circular orbital motion is thus

$$m{\omega_{\mathrm{T}}}^2 r \approx \frac{mc^2 r}{r^2} = \frac{mc^2}{r}. \tag{25}$$

Equating the anticentrifugal force and Coulomb force magnitudes as

$$m{\omega_{\mathrm{T}}}^2 r \approx \frac{e^2}{r^2} \tag{26}$$

obtains, using the proton mass for m,

$$r \approx \frac{e^2}{mc^2} \approx 10^{-15}\mathrm{cm}. \tag{27}$$

This radius is about two orders of magnitude less than the estimated size of the proton [18]. However, it is important to note, the nonrelativistic statement of the Coulomb force used above in Eq. (26) neglected relativistic corrections including an inverse γ^2 factor expected in accordance with the exact expression for the “velocity” electric field of a point charge as given by the Liénard-Wiechert field expressions [19]. An inverse γ^2 factor here can easily lead to a scale of effectivity of the anticentrifugal force to be larger than the size of a nucleon.

A more careful investigation of the expected electromagnetic field for a relativistically-circulating point charge, based on the Liénard-Wiechert field expressions, has been carried out by Rivas [20]. Rivas shows that at distances large compared to the orbital radius, the time-averaged electric field due to a point charge circulating at or near the speed of light is asymptotically similar to the Coulomb field, but at distances near or less than the orbital radius has a time average that is much less than that expected due to an inverse square distance dependence. (It is also interesting that the asymptotically Coulomb-like time average electric field is due to the “acceleration” part of the Liénard-Wiechert field expression, rather than the velocity part, which vanishes for a luminal charged particle except at a single point. It is the time-average of the total electric field of the relativistically-circulating point charge that is asymptotically Coulomb-like.) This also supports that the distance where the anticentrifugal attraction can overcome electrostatic repulsion between fundamental charges is greater than the value given by Eq. (27), and so possibly consistent with the observed size of nucleons such as the proton.

VI. ERRATA

The previous versions (arxiv versions one and two) of this article did not properly take into account the necessity of including the Euler pseudoforce whenever the particle motions depart from a strict circular bound classical orbit. Also, it improperly separated the inertial effects of the electron Coulomb acceleration, on the proton effective force observed in the electron rest frame, from those of the electron acceleration due to the magnetic force. The latter was then used improperly to cancel part of the anti-Coriolois force that does not equate directly with the magnetic force. As the present version shows, this cancellation was not necessary (or useful) when the presence of the relativistic Lorentz factor γ_e is properly noted in the Liénard-Wiechert field expression, and for the restriction to circular orbit. Extension beyond the circular orbit will require incorporation of the anti-Euler force as well as more careful attention to relativistic effects.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The analyses presented here are intended only to be plausibility arguments. A more thorough analysis of the possibility that the magnetic force may be regarded as the anti-Coriolis force of the Thomas precession, that takes full account of relativistic and delay terms to order $(v/c)^2$, is currently underway.

[1] L. H. Thomas, “The Kinematics of an Electron with an Axis,” Philos. Mag. 3, 1-22 (1927)

[2] R. G. Littlejohn, University of California, Berkeley, Physics 209, Fall 2002, Notes 5: Thomas Precession. See the statement on page 8, “... if we fix ourselves to the parallel transported frame, we will feel no centrifugal forces.”

[3] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, third edition, Wiley, New York, 1998, page 664

[4] G. B. Malykin, “Thomas precession: correct and incorrect solutions,” Physics - Uspekhi 49(8) 837-853 (2006)

[5] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, third edition, Wiley, New York, 1998

[6] H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics,* Addison-Wesley, (1950)

[7] A. Bergström, “On the Origin of the Magnetic Field,” Il Nuovo Cimento Vol. 14B, No. 2, 235-242 (1973)

[8] A. Royer, “Why is the magnetic force similar to a Coriolis force,” (preprint) arXiv:1109.3624

[9] H. A. Lorentz, *The Theory of Electrons,* (Leipzig, 1916), second edition

[10] P. Dirac, “Classical theory of radiating electrons,” Proc Roy Soc A , 148 (1938)

[11] J. Bhabha, “Classical theory of mesons,” Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 172, 384 (1939)

[12] J. A. Wheeler and R.P. Feynman,“Classical Electrodynamics in Terms of Interparticle Action,” Rev. Mod. Phys. 21, 431 (1949)

[13] J. De Luca, “Variational principle for the Wheeler-Feynman electrodynamics,” Jour. Math. Phys. 50, 062701 (2009)

[14] P. Dirac, *op. cit.*, See discussion on page 154 between Eqs. (20) and (21)

[15] A. Schild, “Electromagnetic Two-Body Problem,” Phys. Rev. 131, 2762 (1963)

[16] J. De Luca, “Geometric integration of the electromagnetic two-body problem,” Jour. Math. Phys. 48, 012702 (2007)

[17] J. De Luca, “Minimizers with discontinuous velocities for the electromagnetic variational method,” Phys. Rev. E 82, 026212 (2010)

[18] P.J. Mohr, B.N. Taylor, and D.B. Newell (2011), ”The 2010 CODATA Recommended Values of the Fundamental Physical Constants.” This database was developed by J. Baker, M. Douma, and S. Kotochigova. Available: Web Version 6.0. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899.

[19] J. D. Jackson, *op. cit.*, page 664

[20] Martin Rivas, *Kinematical Theory of Spinning Particles,* Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 2001 (Section 6.1.1, pages 254-264.)